

Response to 7/14/04 Office Action

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. The actions taken herein place the Application in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests that they be entered. Claims 15 and 23 are amended. No claims are cancelled. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the 7/14/04 Office Action.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

§102

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under §102 as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2002/0104026 to Barra et al (hereinafter "Barra"). The Office specifically addresses claim 23 and asserts that by analyzing claim 23 dependent claims 24-27 as well as independent claims 1 and 15 and their respective dependent claims are also properly rejected. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant specifically addresses the three independent claims below in numerical order.

Claim 1 is directed to a document tracking method, comprising:

- sending a document from a multifunction device to a network destination;

Response to 7/14/04 Office Action

- sending a tracking component for said document from said multifunction device to a receipt service; and
- generating a return receipt based at least in part on said tracking component at said receipt service when said document is at said network destination to acknowledge receipt of said document by said network destination.

Claim 1 sends a document from a multifunction device to a network destination and sends a tracking component for said document from said multifunction device to a receipt service. Barra describes a system and method where "On a computer operated by an e-mail sender, an online session with a computer at an e-mail center is established. The sender then sends an e-mail packet including an e-mail message destined to a recipient together with a request for a specified verification of e-mail service to the e-mail center. This e-mail is then transmitted from the e-mail center computer to an e-mail address accessible by a computer operated by a recipient". (Barra, Abstract lines 4-9). Such a system does not describe "sending a document from a multifunction device to a network destination" and "sending a tracking component for said document from said multifunction device to a receipt service". Further, Barra's method is not equivalent to the method of claim 1 since in Barra's method if Barra's "email center" is unavailable or "down" inherently the recipient cannot receive the email. The method of claim 1 contains no such inherent limitation. At least for these reasons the elements of claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Barra. Therefore

Response to 7/14/04 Office Action

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and that claim 1 be sent to issuance.

Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the §102 rejections of claims 2-14 be withdrawn and that these claims be sent to issuance.

Amended Claim 15 is directed to a document tracking method, comprising:

- sending an electronic document from a multifunction device to a network destination;
- sending an electronic tracking component for said document from said multifunction device to a receipt service;
- sending a confirmation of receipt to said receipt service when said electronic document is at said network destination; and
- generating a return receipt at said receipt service based at least in part on said confirmation of receipt to acknowledge receipt of said electronic document by said network destination.

Response to 7/14/04 Office Action

Amended Claim 15 sends an electronic document from a multifunction device to a network destination and sends an electronic tracking component for said document from said multifunction device to a receipt service. Barra describes a system and method where a sender "sends an e-mail packet including an e-mail message destined to a recipient together with a request for a specified verification of e-mail service to the e-mail center. This e-mail is then transmitted from the e-mail center computer to an e-mail address accessible by a computer operated by a recipient". (Barra, Abstract lines 6-9). Such a system does not describe the elements of amended claim 15. Therefore Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of amended claim 15 be withdrawn and that amended claim 15 be sent to issuance.

Claims 16-22 depend from amended claim 15 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the §102 rejections of claims 16-22 be withdrawn and that these claims be sent to issuance.

Amended **Claim 23** is directed to a system for tracking a document, comprising:

- a multifunction device for sending said document to a network destination;
- a tracking component generated for said document and sent from said multifunction device;

Response to 7/14/04 Office Action

- a confirmation of receipt sent from said network destination when said document is at said network destination; and
- a receipt service for receiving said tracking component and said confirmation of receipt and for generating a return receipt based at least in part on said tracking component and said confirmation of receipt to acknowledge receipt of said document by said network destination and wherein the system is configured to deliver said document from the multifunction device to the network device without relying on an operational status of the receipt service.

The system of amended claim 23 is not described or suggested by Barra. The amendment to claim 23 is supported in the specification of the present application as originally filed. Specifically, the system is configured to deliver the document from the multifunction device to the network device without relying on an operational status of the receipt service. In contrast Barra's system requires:

establishing an online session on a computer operated by an e-mail sender with a computer at an e-mail center, and sending, by the sender, an e-mail packet including an e-mail message destined to a recipient together with a request for a specified verification e-mail service to the e-mail center. The e-mail

Response to 7/14/04 Office Action

center computer transmits the e-mail to an e-mail address accessible by a computer operated by an intended recipient. The e-mail center receives notification when said recipient at least receives and opens said e-mail and, provides, by the e-mail center, at least the requested e-mail notification to said e-mail center. (Barra, Para 56 lines 5-end).

Barra's system relies upon operation of the e-mail center to deliver the e-mail to the recipient. In such a system the e-mail is sent to the e-mail center as part of the e-mail packet. If Barra's email center becomes unavailable such as due to a power outage or software 'lock-up' the e-mail may not be delivered and the sender and the intended recipient may both remain unaware of the problem. Such a system does not describe or suggest the elements of amended claim 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of amended claim 23 be withdrawn and that claim 23 be sent to issuance.

Claims 24-27 depend from amended claim 23 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the §102 rejections of claims 24-27 be withdrawn and that these claims be sent to issuance.

Response to 7/14/04 Office Action

Conclusion

Claims 1-27 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: 10/13/04



Paul Mitchell
Reg. No. 44,453
Phone No. (509)324-9256x237